

Superstring Compactification and Target Space Duality[★]

John H. Schwarz

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125

ABSTRACT

This review talk focusses on some of the interesting developments in the area of superstring compactification that have occurred in the last couple of years. These include the discovery that “mirror symmetric” pairs of Calabi–Yau spaces, with completely distinct geometries and topologies, correspond to a single (2,2) conformal field theory. Also, the concept of target-space duality, originally discovered for toroidal compactification, is being extended to Calabi–Yau spaces. It also associates sets of geometrically distinct manifolds to a single conformal field theory.

A couple of other topics are presented very briefly. One concerns conceptual challenges in reconciling gravity and quantum mechanics. It is suggested that certain “distasteful allegations” associated with quantum gravity such as loss of quantum coherence, unpredictability of fundamental parameters of particle physics, and paradoxical features of black holes are likely to be circumvented by string theory. Finally there is a brief discussion of the importance of supersymmetry at the TeV scale, both from a practical point of view and as a potentially significant prediction of string theory.

Presented at Strings and Symmetries 1991

May 1991

★ Work supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC0381-ER40050

1. Introduction

The conference organizers have asked me to give a review survey of significant developments in superstring compactification that have occurred in the last couple of years since the last review papers that I wrote on this subject.¹ A great deal of impressive progress has been made, and it will only be possible to survey a portion of it. The choice of topics is based mostly on what has caught my attention, and what I have been able to digest. There are undoubtedly many important developments that will not be mentioned.

The two main topics to be discussed are Calabi–Yau compactification and target-space duality. Two important developments in Calabi–Yau compactification will be stressed. The first is the existence of holomorphic prepotentials that determine the Kähler potentials that describe the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{11}$, associated with complex structure deformations and Kähler form deformations, respectively. The second is the remarkable mirror symmetry that associates a pair of Calabi–Yau spaces to the same (2,2) conformal field theory. They are related to one another by interchange of the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{11}$.

The most famous example of target–space duality is the $R \rightarrow 1/R$ symmetry associated with compactification on a circle of radius R . As with mirror symmetry this transformation relates distinct geometries that are associated with the same conformal field theory. Generalizations appropriate to toroidal compactifications have been known for some time and will be reviewed very briefly. The little bit that is known about such symmetries in the case of K3 and Calabi–Yau space compactification will also be discussed. An interesting proposal has been made to restrict the possibilities for low-energy effective actions that incorporate nonperturbative supersymmetry breaking by the duality symmetries.

Recently, my interest in target-space duality was reactivated by the realization that it can be viewed as a discrete symmetry group that is a subgroup of spontaneously broken continuous gauge symmetries—what has been referred to as ‘local gauge symmetry.’ This led me to propose that it could have a bearing on resolving

certain deep problems associated with quantum gravity.² After reviewing some of the disturbing allegations that are made about the inevitable consequences of reconciling general relativity and quantum mechanics, I will discuss possible ways in which they may be circumvented in string theory.

The concluding section makes a plea to demonstrate to our experimental colleagues that our work is relevant. It is suggested that a strong case could be made for supersymmetry at the TeV scale as an almost inevitable feature of any quasi-realistic string vacuum. This being so, perhaps it would not be inappropriate for us to stick our necks out a bit and call this a ‘prediction of string theory.’

2. Progress in Calabi–Yau Compactification

Let me begin by recalling a few basic facts. By definition, a Calabi–Yau space is a Kähler manifold of three (complex) dimensions and vanishing first Chern class. The complex (Dolbeault) cohomology groups $H^{p,q}$ have dimensions b_{pq} given by the Hodge diamond

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & 1 & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & 0 & & b_{11} & & 0 \\
 & 1 & & b_{21} & & b_{21} & 1 \\
 & & 0 & & b_{11} & & 0 \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & & & 1 & &
 \end{array}$$

One generator of $H^{1,1}$ is the Kähler form $J = ig_{\mu\bar{\nu}}dx^\mu \wedge dx^{\bar{\nu}}$. Thus $b_{11} \geq 1$. A Calabi–Yau space, with specified Kähler class, admits a unique Ricci-flat metric. Also, there exists a covariantly constant spinor λ , in terms of which the holomorphic three-form is $\Omega_{\mu\nu\rho} = \lambda\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\lambda$.

In the context of heterotic string compactification, the existence of λ is responsible for the fact that the 4D low-energy theory has N=1 supersymmetry. Altogether, the massless spectrum contains the following N=1 supermultiplets:

- a) N=1 supergravity (graviton and gravitino)
- b) Yang–Mills supermultiplets (adjoint vectors and spinors for $E_6 \times E_8 \times \dots$)
- c) Various chiral supermultiplets (Weyl spinor and a scalar)

The chiral supermultiplets include matter and moduli multiplets. The matter multiplets consist of b_{11} generations (27 of E_6) and b_{21} antigerations ($\overline{27}$ of E_6). Which of these one chooses to call ‘generations’ and ‘antigerations’ is purely a matter of convention, of course. The moduli consist of an ‘S field’ and ‘T fields.’ The S field contains the dilaton ϕ and the axion θ . The vev of the dilaton gives the string coupling constant ($\langle \phi \rangle \sim 1/g^2$), and θ is the 4D dual of the antisymmetric tensor field $B_{\mu\nu}$. Locally, the vevs of ϕ and θ parametrize the coset manifold $SU(1,1)/U(1)$.

The T fields consist of b_{11} E_6 singlets whose vevs parametrize the moduli space of Kähler form deformations, $\mathcal{M}_{11}$, and b_{21} E_6 singlets whose vevs parametrize the space of complex structure deformations, $\mathcal{M}_{21}$. Altogether, the Calabi–Yau moduli space is the tensor product $\mathcal{M}_{CY} = \mathcal{M}_{11} \times \mathcal{M}_{21}$. Locally, this is the same thing as the space of (2,2) conformal field theories, though the Kähler geometry of $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ differs in the two cases by the effects of world sheet instantons. However, as we will discuss, they differ globally by duality symmetries, so that the moduli space of (2,2) theories is given by $\mathcal{M}_{(2,2)} = \mathcal{M}_{CY}/G$, where G is a discrete group. This is the space that classifies inequivalent string compactifications.

Remarkably, the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{11}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ are themselves Kähler manifolds. Here I will simply state the salient facts without attempting to give the proofs, which can be found in the literature.³

Let z^α , $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, b_{21}$ be local complex coordinates for $\mathcal{M}_{21}$. Then linearly independent generators of $H^{2,1}$ are given by

$$\chi_{\alpha\kappa\lambda\bar{\mu}} = -\frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\kappa\lambda\rho}g^{\rho\bar{\eta}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\alpha}g_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, b_{21}.$$

Out of $\chi_\alpha = \chi_{\alpha\kappa\lambda\bar{\mu}}dx^\kappa \wedge dx^\lambda \wedge d\bar{x}^{\bar{\mu}}$ and $\bar{\chi}_{\bar{\beta}}$ one constructs the Kähler metric for $\mathcal{M}_{21}$

by the formula

$$G_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = -\frac{\int_M \chi_\alpha \wedge \bar{\chi}_{\bar{\beta}}}{\int_M \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}^\beta} \log \left(i \int_M \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega} \right).$$

From this it follows that $K = -\log \left(i \int_M \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega} \right)$ is the Kähler potential.

Moreover, $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ is a Kähler manifold with a *holomorphic prepotential*. (Such Kähler manifolds are sometimes said to be of ‘restricted type.’) The formula is given most succinctly using projective coordinates (in $P_{b_{21}}$) z^a , $a = 1, 2, \dots, b_{21} + 1$, defined with respect to a canonical homology basis of H_3 . The basic cycles A^a and B_b are arranged to intersect in a manner analogous to the A and B cycles of a Riemann surface. The coordinates z^a are given by $z^a = \int_{A^a} \Omega$ and the derivatives of the holomorphic prepotential $\mathcal{G}(z^a)$ are given by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^a} \mathcal{G} = \int_{B_a} \Omega$. In terms of $\mathcal{G}$ and its complex conjugate $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\bar{z}^a)$ the Kähler potential is given by

$$e^{-K} = -i \left(z^a \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{G}}}{\partial \bar{z}^a} - \bar{z}^a \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial z^a} \right).$$

The prepotential also encodes the Yukawa couplings of the antigerations, which are given by its third derivatives. (I am confident that more details of this construction will be presented by other speakers.)

The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{11}$ has a very similar description. In terms of local complex coordinates w^A , with $A = 1, 2, \dots, b_{11}$. Its metric is given in terms of a Kähler potential by $G_{A\bar{B}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial w^A} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}^B} K$, as usual. The Kähler potential is given by $K = -\log \kappa(J, J, J)$, where $\kappa(J, J, J) = \frac{4}{3} \int_M J \wedge J \wedge J$ and J is the Kähler form. In terms of projective coordinates w^i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, b_{11} + 1$, there is again a holomorphic prepotential $\mathcal{F}(w^i)$ with

$$e^{-K} = -i \left(w^i \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial \bar{w}^i} - \bar{w}^i \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial w^i} \right).$$

As before, the third derivatives of $\mathcal{F}$ give the Yukawa couplings of the generations. The significant asymmetry between $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ in the case of the geometric limit is

that $\mathcal{F}$ is a cubic function so that the Yukawa couplings are constants, whereas $\mathcal{G}$ is a complicated nonpolynomial expression, so that those Yukawa couplings depend on the complex structure deformation moduli.

A Calabi–Yau space corresponds to a geometric limit of a (2,2) superconformal field theory. This geometric limit includes effects to every order in α' in the associated sigma model, but it does not include the nonperturbative effects associated with world-sheet instantons. It turns out that these world-sheet instantons contribute to the moduli space of Kähler form deformations $\mathcal{M}_{11}$ but not to the moduli space of complex structure deformations $\mathcal{M}_{21}$. As a result the prepotential $\mathcal{G}$ can be computed exactly in the geometric limit, but the prepotential $\mathcal{F}$ cannot. The earlier assertion that $\mathcal{F}$ is a cubic function referred to the geometric limit. When the instanton contributions are included it is no longer cubic. It is the latter expression that is relevant to string theory. This modification of Calabi–Yau geometry implied by the corresponding conformal field theory is sometimes referred to as “quantum geometry” in the recent literature.

We now turn to the mirror symmetry conjecture. The similarity in the description of the two moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}_{11}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ suggests that to every Calabi–Yau space M (with $b_{21} > 0$) there is a mirror partner Calabi–Yau space $\tilde{M}$ such that the two moduli spaces are interchanged:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{11} = \mathcal{M}_{21} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{21} = \mathcal{M}_{11}.$$

Clearly, in view of the remarks made above, this is only possible if we include the instanton corrections in the description of the moduli spaces. Thus the precise statement of the conjecture is that there is a mirror partner Calabi–Yau space such that the two spaces correspond to distinct geometric limits of the same (2,2) conformal field theory. This is a remarkable conjecture from a mathematical point of view, since the CY spaces have completely different geometries and topologies. It is also of some practical importance from the physical point of view, since computations of the prepotentials are significantly easier to carry out in the geometric limit (using topological formulas) than for the exact CFT in general. By computing moduli

spaces of complex-structure deformations for a pair of mirror CY spaces one deduces (by the equations above) the exact geometry of the moduli spaces of Kähler form deformations, including the effects of world-sheet instantons.

A considerable amount of evidence in support of the mirror symmetry conjecture has been amassed. I am not completely sure of the history, but I believe the idea originated when Dixon noticed the symmetrical way in which generations and anti-generations are treated in Calabi-Yau compactification of the heterotic string à la Gepner, and when Lerche, Vafa, and Warner noticed the symmetrical appearance of the (c,c) and (a,c) rings in N=2 Landau-Ginzburg theory.⁴ Candelas, Lynker, and Schimmrigk computed the Hodge numbers b_{11} and b_{21} for several thousand CY spaces that can be described as intersections of weighted complex projective spaces and observed that there was an almost perfect correspondence between pairs of CY spaces with these numbers interchanged.⁵ Some unpaired examples are to be expected in their list, since it is certainly not complete. Given that fact, it is remarkable how few of them there are. Also, one class of spaces is certainly special. There exist Calabi-Yau spaces with $b_{21} = 0$. The mirror of such a space should have $b_{11} = 0$, but such a space cannot be a Calabi-Yau space, since they always have the Kähler form itself as at least one generator of $H^{1,1}$. The significance of this class of exceptions is being investigated by the experts. It may be of some practical importance if we hope to eventually find an example that gives three generations and no antigerations, so as to avoid the problem of understanding how extra generations and anti-generations pair up to acquire a large mass. Such a space with $b_{11} = 3$ and $b_{21} = 0$ might not exist, however.

Further evidence in support of the mirror symmetry conjecture and insight into various structural details have been obtained from a variety of additional studies. These include analysis of explicit examples based on (2,2) orbifolds⁶ and additional studies of the Landau-Ginzburg connection.⁷ Another approach utilizes Gepner's correspondence between Calabi-Yau compactification and compactification of Type II superstring theories. The constructions based on Type IIA and Type IIB theories turn out to be related by mirror symmetry. This fact provides a rather powerful tool

for detailed studies, since it benefits from the restrictions implied by the additional supersymmetry of the Type II theories.⁸ Finally, I should mention the detailed investigation of a specific mirror pair of CY spaces by Candelas *et al.*⁹ They compute the prepotential $\mathcal{F}$ for the one-dimensional moduli space of the Kähler class for the CY space given by a quintic polynomial in P_4 and compare it to the prepotential $\mathcal{G}$ for the mirror space (given by orbifolding the original space by a suitable discrete symmetry group). By comparing the two expressions they are able to explicitly identify the instanton contributions and infer the number of “holomorphic curves” of various sorts—deep results in algebraic geometry.

3. Target Space Duality

The notion of target space duality is becoming a more and more prevalent theme in string theory, with a wide range of applications and implications. Target-space dualities are discrete symmetries of compactified string theories, whose existence suggests a breakdown of geometric concepts at the Planck scale. The simplest example is given by closed bosonic strings with one dimension of space taken to form a circle of radius R . In this case the momentum component of a string corresponding to this dimension is quantized: $p = n/R$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is a general consequence of quantum mechanics and is not special to strings, of course. What is special for strings is the existence of winding modes. A closed string can wrap m times around the circular dimension. A string state with momentum and winding quantum numbers n and m , respectively, receives a zero-mode contribution to its mass-squared given by¹⁰

$$M_0^2 = (n/R)^2 + (mR/\alpha')^2,$$

where α' is the usual Regge slope parameter. It is evident that the simultaneous interchanges $R \leftrightarrow \alpha'/R$ and $m \leftrightarrow n$ leaves the mass formula invariant.¹¹ In fact, the entire physics of the interacting theory is left unaltered provided that one simultaneously rescales the dilaton field (whose expectation value controls the string coupling constant) according to $\phi \rightarrow \phi - \ln(R/\sqrt{\alpha'})$.¹² The basic idea is that the radii R

and α'/R both correspond to the same ($c = 1$) conformal field theory, and it is the conformal field theory that determines the physics. This is the simplest example of the general phenomenon called “target-space duality.”

The circular compactification described above has been generalized to the case of a d -dimensional torus, characterized by d^2 constants G_{ab} and B_{ab} .¹³ The symmetric matrix G is the metric of the torus, while B is an antisymmetric matrix. These parameters describe the moduli space of toroidal compactification and can be interpreted as the vacuum expectation values of d^2 massless scalar fields. The dynamics of the toroidal string coordinates X^a is described by the world sheet action

$$S = \int d^2\sigma [G_{ab} \partial^\alpha X^a \partial_\alpha X^b + \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} B_{ab} \partial_\alpha X^a \partial_\beta X^b]$$

In this case we can introduce d -component vectors of integers m^a and n_a to describe the winding modes and discrete momenta, respectively. A straightforward calculation then gives the zero-mode contributions

$$M_0^2 = G_{ab} m^a m^b + G^{ab} (n_a - B_{ac} m^c) (n_b - B_{bd} m^d)$$

where G^{ab} represents the inverse of the matrix G_{ab} . The one-dimensional case is recovered by setting $G_{11} = R^2/\alpha'$ and $B = 0$. The generalization of the duality symmetry becomes $G + B \rightarrow (G + B)^{-1}$ and $\phi \rightarrow \phi - \frac{1}{2} \ln \det(G + B)$. The B term in the world-sheet action is topological. The parameters B_{ab} are analogous to the θ parameter in QCD, and the quantum theory is invariant under integer shifts $B_{ab} \rightarrow B_{ab} + N_{ab}$. Combined with the inversion symmetry, these generate the infinite discrete group $O(d, d; Z)$.¹⁴ (The analogous group in the case of the heterotic string is $O(d + 16, d; Z)$.) Thus, whereas the moduli G_{ab} and B_{ab} locally parametrize the coset space $O(d, d)/[O(d) \times O(d)]$, points in this space related by $O(d, d; Z)$ transformations correspond to the same conformal field theory and should be identified. It is conjectured that when nonperturbative effects break the flatness of the effective potential, so that the scalar fields that correspond to the moduli can acquire mass, the discrete duality symmetries of the theory are preserved.¹⁵

The $O(d, d; Z)$ target space duality symmetries are discrete remnants of spontaneously broken gauge symmetries.¹⁶ Specifically, for values of the moduli corresponding to a fixed point of a subgroup of this discrete group, the corresponding string background has enhanced gauge symmetry. (This is most easily demonstrated by showing that there are additional massless vector string states in the spectrum.) At such a point some of the duality symmetry transformations coincide with finite gauge transformations. By considering all possible such fixed points it is possible to identify an infinite number of distinct gauge symmetries, with all but a finite number of them spontaneously broken for any particular choice of the moduli.

One may wonder whether the occurrence of target-space dualities is special to toroidal compactification or whether it occurs generically for curved compactification spaces such as Calabi–Yau manifolds. The four-dimensional analog, namely K3 compactification, has been analyzed in some detail.¹⁷ In that case (applied to the heterotic string) the moduli space is $O(20, 4)/[O(20) \times O(4)]$, parametrized by 80 massless scalar fields and the duality group is $O(20, 4; Z)$. Remarkably, this is exactly the same manifold and duality group that arises in the case of toroidal compactification of the heterotic string to six dimensions. One might be tempted to speculate that the two compactifications are equivalent, but that cannot be correct since K3 compactification breaks half of the supersymmetry while toroidal compactification does not break any.¹⁸ By modding out certain symmetries of the torus, it is possible to form an orbifold for which half the supersymmetry is broken and the moduli space is still essentially the same. This orbifold seems likely to correspond (at least locally) to the same conformal field theory as K3. Having spaces of distinct topology correspond to identical conformal field theories goes beyond what we learned from tori. (There various different geometries all having the same topology were identified.) However, as we have seen, such identifications do exist for Calabi–Yau spaces, which occur in mirror pairs of opposite Euler number.

The moduli space of a Calabi–Yau compactification factorizes into the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ that describes complex-structure deformations times the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{11}$ that describes Kähler form deformations. There are duality symmetry transformations

that act on each of these spaces separately. The two classes of transformations would seem to have very different interpretations from a geometrical point of view. However, the two factors are interchanged for the mirror manifold, so if one associates them with a mirror pair of Calabi–Yau spaces, then they appear on an equivalent footing. The problem is to determine the target-space duality group that acts on each of these moduli spaces. A natural action of the discrete group $Sp(2 + 2b_{21}, Z)$ can be defined on the third cohomology group

$$H^3 = H^{(3,0)} \oplus H^{(2,1)} \oplus H^{(1,2)} \oplus H^{(0,3)}$$

analogous to the symplectic modular group for Riemann surfaces. This symplectic group contains the possible discrete symmetries of $\mathcal{M}_{21}$. The mirror symmetry implies a corresponding action of $Sp(2 + 2b_{11}, Z)$ on the space

$$H^{(0,0)} \oplus H^{(1,1)} \oplus H^{(2,2)} \oplus H^{(3,3)}$$

describing possible discrete symmetries of $\mathcal{M}_{11}$. Thus altogether the target space duality of the (quantum corrected) Calabi–Yau space should be given by some subgroup

$$G_{TD} \subseteq Sp(2 + 2b_{21}, Z) \times Sp(2 + 2b_{11}, Z).$$

Examples have been worked out in special cases.

A potentially important application of the duality symmetries has been proposed in connection with the construction of low-energy effective actions. The idea is that these should be exact symmetries of the complete quantum theory and should still be present even after nonperturbative effects (such as those that break supersymmetry) are taken into account and after heavy fields are integrated out. This means that, in terms of a low-energy effective action in four dimensions with N=1 supersymmetry, the duality symmetries should be realized on the superpotential, which is therefore restricted to be a suitable automorphic function. This is a very significant restriction

on the characterization of the low-energy theory. Therefore there is some hope for saying quite a bit about nonperturbative effects without solving the difficult problem of computing them from first principles. There is some evidence that the combination of gluino condensation and duality symmetry are sufficient to remove all flat directions from the potential.¹⁹ This means that the size of the compact space, which is one of the moduli, is dynamically determined and all the other parameters that determine the vacuum configuration are also determined. Supersymmetry is broken and the cosmological constant typically comes out negative (corresponding to anti de Sitter space). However, there are some examples for which the cosmological constant vanishes.²⁰ Recently, there have been studies of automorphic prepotentials for general (2,2) compactifications.²¹

4. Conceptual Challenges in Reconciling Gravity and Quantum Mechanics

There are a variety of technical and conceptual obstacles that need to be overcome if a satisfactory understanding of the reconciliation of general relativity and quantum mechanics is to be achieved. These can be divided into two categories—amazing requirements and distasteful allegations. If string theory is the correct approach to constructing a fully consistent unification of all fundamental forces, then it should hold the keys to the right answers. In this case, our job is to discern the clever tricks that string theory employs. This may sound like a strange way to approach the problem, but string theory has proved to be a fruitful source of inspiration in the past. Examples range from the discovery of supersymmetry to unexpected anomaly and divergence cancellation mechanisms and much more. It could hold many more surprises in store for us.

One “amazing requirement” is perturbative finiteness (or renormalizability). This is not yet fully established, but there is considerable evidence that this is achieved in string theory, even though it is apparently impossible for any point-particle field theory that incorporates general relativity (in four dimensions). A second requirement is that causality have a precise meaning when the space-time metric is a dynamical quantum field. This undoubtedly happens in string theory, but it would be nice to

understand in detail just what is involved. Third, the theory should be applicable to the entire universe, perhaps describing it by a single wave function. An obvious question in this connection is whether string theory suggests some special choice of boundary condition, such as that proposed by Hartle and Hawking, and whether this could provide a rationale for selecting a particular vacuum configuration.

The second category of conceptual issues consists of certain “distasteful allegations”, which string theory might cleverly evade. The first of these is the claim that effects associated with virtual black holes cause pure quantum states to evolve into mixed states.²² If this were true, it would mean that the entire mathematical framework of quantum mechanics is inadequate. It seems reasonable to explore whether string theory could avoid allowing pure states to evolve into mixed states. To the extent that string theory can be consistently formulated as an S matrix theory, it seems almost inevitable that this should work out. A second distasteful allegation is that wormhole contributions to the Euclidean path integral²³ render the parameters of particle physics stochastic.²⁴ In a previous paper,² I referred to this phenomenon as ‘the curse of the wormhole,’ since it would imply that even when the correct microscopic theory is known, it will still not be possible to compute experimental parameters such as coupling constants, mass ratios, and mixing angles from first principles.

A third issue concerns the classification of black holes. According to the “no hair” theorems, in classical general relativity black holes are fully characterized by mass, electric charge, and angular momentum. On the other hand, they have a (large) entropy that is proportional to the area of the event horizon.²⁵ This amount of entropy corresponds to a number of degrees of freedom that is roughly what one would get from a vibrating membrane just above the horizon.²⁶ In fact, ‘t Hooft has tried to make sense of such a physical picture, interpreting the membrane as a string world sheet.²⁷ Alternatively, the black hole degrees of freedom might be accounted for in string theory in more subtle ways that utilize possibilities for evading the classical no-hair theorems by quantum effects. Recent studies have shown that black holes can have ‘quantum hair,’ which is observable (in principle) by generalized Bohm–Aharonov interference measurements.^{28,29} Charges that can characterize quantum hair for black

holes are precisely the same ones whose conservation cannot be destroyed by wormhole effects. Thus the nicest outcome might be for the correct fundamental theory to provide so many different types of quantum hair as to produce precisely the number of degrees of freedom that is required to account for the entropy of black holes. In a theory with enough distinct degrees of freedom to account for black hole entropy and to protect quantum coherence, there should be no deleterious effects due to wormholes.

A mechanism that has been proposed as an origin for quantum hair is for a continuous gauge symmetry to break spontaneously leaving a discrete subgroup unbroken. As we have discussed, string theory has a large group of discrete symmetries that can be understood as remnants of spontaneously broken gauge symmetries, namely the target space dualities. This fact led me to propose that these are the relevant symmetries for understanding quantum hair in string theory.^{2*} However, following further studies and discussions with others, it has become clear that this suggestion has serious problems, mostly stemming from the fact that these symmetries are almost all broken for any particular choice of vacuum configuration.

The first proposal for “quantum hair” of black holes, detectable only by Bohm–Aharonov-type interference effects, was put forward a few years ago by Bowick et al.²⁸ As initially formulated, the analysis only applied to theories containing a massless ‘axion.’ However, a subsequent paper demonstrated that this restriction was not essential and that a suitable massive axion could do the same job.³²

Stripping away all interactions, the basic idea can be explained quite simply. Assume four-dimensional space-time and let A_μ be a $U(1)$ vector field and $B_{\mu\nu}$ an antisymmetric tensor gauge field (called the axion). In the language of forms, the associated field strengths are given by $H = dB$ and $F = dA$. The action consists of the usual kinetic terms, schematically given by $S_{kin} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x (H^2 + F^2)$, and a topological mass term of the form $S_{mass} = m \int B \wedge F$. The equations of motion,

* This idea has been proposed independently in Ref. [30], though the emphasis there is on ‘duality of the S field.’

$d*H = mF$ and $d*F = -mH$, imply that both fields have mass m . What happens is that the antisymmetric tensor eats the vector to become massive. In four dimensions it is equivalent to say that the vector eats the scalar (which is dual to $B_{\mu\nu}$) to become massive.

The axion charge in a region of three-dimensional space V with boundary ∂V is defined by

$$Q_{axion} = \int_V H = \int_{\partial V} B.$$

For a space-time with nontrivial second homology, such as Schwarzschild space-time (whose topology is $S^2 \times R^2$), it is possible to obtain nonzero axion charge while having the H field vanish outside some central region. In this case the B field on the enclosing two-surface is proportional to a two-form that is closed but not exact (i.e., belongs to the second cohomology group). In a theory with axions there are strings (cosmic or fundamental) that contribute a term to the action proportional to $\int_{\Sigma} B_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$. As a result, a world sheet enclosing a black hole with axionic charge gives a Bohm–Aharonov phase $\exp[2\pi i Q_{axion}]$. This makes the charge observable through interference effects (modulo unity). If there were nontrivial third homology, the axion charge itself would be quantized and nothing would be observable.³³ However, this is not the case for a Schwarzschild black hole.

In the string theory context, the formula for the field strength H is embellished by various Chern–Simons terms that were omitted in the discussion above. Also, one-loop effects in ten dimensions give contributions to the effective action of the form $\int B \wedge \text{tr}(F^4)$, which play a crucial role in anomaly cancellation.³⁴ Upon compactification it can happen that the ten-dimensional gauge fields acquire expectation values that result in a nonvanishing effective term of the form $\int B \wedge F$, where F is a $U(1)$ gauge field in four dimensions, as required to give mass to the axion. This happens when the associated $U(1)$ gauge symmetry in four dimensions appears to be anomalous by the usual criteria based on triangle diagrams. However, as in ten dimensions, $B_{\mu\nu}$ has nontrivial gauge transformation properties that give compensating

contributions and render the quantum theory consistent.

Axion charge appears to be a good candidate for quantum hair in string theory. Of course, if this particular charge were the only type of quantum hair in string theory, we would still be very far from achieving the goal of finding enough quantum degrees of freedom to account for all the entropy of black holes and overcoming the other problems in quantum gravity that we have discussed.

Fortunately, string theory seems to allow various categories of generalizations of axion charge that could provide many more kinds of quantum hair. For example, the field $B_{\mu\nu}(x, y)$ is defined in ten dimensions. (Here x refers to four-dimensional space-time and y to six compactified dimensions.) In the usual Kaluza–Klein fashion, this represents an infinite family of four-dimensional fields $B_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}(x)$ corresponding to an expansion in harmonics of the compact space of the form $\sum C_n(y)B_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}(x)$. The analysis above only utilized the axion corresponding to the leading term in this series for which $C(y)$ is a constant. The other terms describe fields that naturally have masses of the order of the compactification scale. It seems plausible that they could provide additional types of quantum hair. (When the analysis is done carefully, target-space duality may yet prove to be important!) Even this infinite collection of charges may not be the end of the story. The massive string spectrum contains an infinite number of gauge fields of every possible tensor structure. The particular gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$ is special by virtue of its coupling to the string world sheet, which played a crucial role in the reasoning above. Other gauge fields enter the world sheet action with couplings given by their associated vertex operators. For fields that are not massless in ten dimensions these give nonrenormalizable couplings in the sigma model, and are therefore difficult to analyze. Still, from a more general string field theory point of view, they are not really very different, and so there may be many more possibilities for quantum hair associated with the massive string spectrum.

In addition to string symmetries altering some consequences of general relativity at the quantum level, it is also possible that special features of string theory play an important role at the classical level. One indication of this appears in a recent study

of charged black holes,³⁵ where effects of the dilaton field make qualitative changes already at zeroth order in α' . Specifically, whereas a Reissner–Nordstrom black hole of mass M and charge Q has its horizon at the radius $R_H = M + \sqrt{M^2 - Q^2}$, the corresponding string solution has $R_H = 2M\sqrt{1 - Q^2/2M^2}$. Also, as the charge of the black hole approaches its maximum allowed value, the entropy $S \rightarrow 4\pi M^2$ and the temperature $T \rightarrow 0$ in the Reissner–Nordstrom case. In the string case one finds $S \rightarrow 0$ and $T \rightarrow 8\pi M$. (All these results are to leading order in α' and $\hbar$.) As one might expect, the thermodynamic description breaks down in either of these extreme limits.³⁶

5. The Importance of Supersymmetry

In order to gain the attention and respect of our experimental colleagues it is important to make predictions that bear on near-term experimental possibilities. It is pretty clear that the best prospect in this regard is supersymmetry. It would be nice if we could honestly assert that supersymmetry (broken at the weak scale) is an inevitable feature of any quasi-realistic string model and thus a necessity if string theory is the correct basis of unification. Experimentalists could then be in a position to demonstrate that “string theory is false” or to discover important evidence in its support. But can we honestly make such an assertion?

Certainly no string models that are remotely realistic have been constructed without low-energy supersymmetry. Also, in the context of string theory any alternative mechanism for dealing with the hierarchy problem seems very unlikely. Still, if as is generally assumed, string theory has a clever way of preventing a cosmological constant from arising once supersymmetry is broken, then maybe it could also have a clever stringy alternative for preventing Higgs particles from acquiring unification scale masses through radiative corrections. No plausible alternative to supersymmetry is known, but how sure can we be that one doesn’t exist? There is always the possibility that some mechanism, not yet considered, could be important, but that shouldn’t completely prevent from us ever sticking our necks out a bit. I don’t think it would be dishonest for string theorists to assert that according to our present

understanding, supersymmetry broken at the weak scale is required by string theory.

In fact, the experimental prospects are beginning to look up. The requirement that the three couplings of the standard model should become equal at a unification scale fails badly without supersymmetry. On the other hand, for a susy scale ranging from 100 GeV to 10 TeV they merge very nicely at about 10^{16} GeV.³⁷ While this is far from conclusive, it is a very impressive bit of evidence. Given the present experimental situation, together with various theoretical and astrophysical considerations, it seems quite plausible that the lightest supersymmetry particles are at the low end of this range. Others, such as squarks and gluinos, maybe be around a TeV or so. If this is correct, it is unlikely that any of these particles will be produced and detected before the LHC or SSC comes on line. However, supersymmetry has important implications for the Higgs sector that could be confirmed sooner.

Low-energy supersymmetry has two Higgs doublets, which after symmetry breaking result in a charged particle $H^\pm$, and three neutral particles h , H , and A . The minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) requires, at tree level, that h is the lightest of these and that its mass not exceed M_Z . When radiative corrections are taken into account, it can be somewhat heavier, depending on the mass of the top quark. For example, if the top quark mass does not exceed 160 GeV then the h mass should not exceed 120 GeV. For a top quark mass below 130 GeV the bound is lowered to 100 GeV. These bounds need not be saturated, so there is a reasonable chance for a mass in the range 50-100 GeV, making it open to discovery at LEP 2. Another interesting possibility is that the top quark could decay into H^+ plus a bottom quark. If it is kinematically allowed, this could be a significant branching fraction. (The precise prediction depends on the parameter $\tan\beta = v_2/v_1$.) I am optimistic that some of these particles will turn up during this decade and that this will open up an exciting era for string theorists (as well as all particle physicists).

REFERENCES

1. J. H. Schwarz, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A2** (1987) 593–643; *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A4** (1989) 2653–2713.
2. J. H. Schwarz, “Target Space Duality and the Curse of the Wormhole,” CALT-68-1688, to be published in *Beyond the Standard Model II*, the proceedings of a conference held at the University of Oklahoma (World Scientific 1991).
3. S. Ferrara and A. Strominger, in *Strings 89*, Proc. Superstring Workshop, Texas A&M Univ., ed. R. Arnowitt et al., (World Scientific 1990); P. Candelas and X. C. de la Ossa, *Nucl. Phys.* **B355** (1991) 455.
4. W. Lerche, C. Vafa, and N. Warner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B324** (1989) 427.
5. P. Candelas, M. Lynker, and R. Schimmrigk, *Nucl. Phys.* **B341** (1990) 383.
6. B. R. Greene and M. R. Plesser, *Nucl. Phys.* **B338** (1990) 15.
7. P. S. Aspinwall, C. A. Lütken, and G. G. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* **241B** (1990) 373; P. S. Aspinwall and C. A. Lütken, *Nucl. Phys.* **355** (1991) 482.
8. S. Ferrara, M. Bodner, and A. C. Cadavid, *Phys. Lett.* **247B** (1990) 25; *Class. Quant. Grav.* **8** (1991) 789.
9. P. Candelas, X. C. de la Ossa, P. S. Green, and L. Parkes, *Nucl. Phys.* **B359** (1991) 21; *Phys. Lett.* **258B** (1991) 118.
10. M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, and L. Brink, *Nucl. Phys.* **B198** (1982) 474.
11. K. Kikkawa and M. Yamasaki, *Phys. Lett.* **149B** (1984) 357; N. Sakai and I. Senda, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **75** (1984) 692.
12. E. Alvarez and M. A. R. Osorio, *Phys. Rev.* **D40** (1989) 1150; D. Gross and I. Klebanov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B344** (1990) 475; E. Smith and J. Polchinski, “Duality Survives Time Dependence,” Univ. of Texas preprint UTTG-07-91, Jan. 1991; A. A. Tseytlin, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A16** (1991) 1721.
13. K. S. Narain, *Phys. Lett.* **169B** (1986) 41; K. S. Narain, M. H. Sarmadi, and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B279** (1987) 369.
14. V. P. Nair, A. Shapere, A. Strominger, and F. Wilczek, *Nucl. Phys.* **B287** (1987) 402; A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, *Nucl. Phys.* **B320** (1989) 669; A. Giveon, E. Rabinovici, and G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B322** (1989) 167.
15. S. Ferrara, D. Lüster, A. Shapere, and S. Theisen, *Phys. Lett.* **225B** (1989) 363; A. Giveon and M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett.* **246B** (1990) 54; *Nucl. Phys.* **B355** (1991) 422.
16. M. Dine, P. Huet, and N. Seiberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B322** (1989) 301.
17. N. Seiberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B303** (1988) 286.

18. M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, and P. C. West, *Nucl. Phys.* **B254** (1985) 327.
19. A. Font, L. E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst, and F. Quevedo, *Phys. Lett.* **245B** (1990) 401; S. Ferrara, N. Magnoli, T. R. Taylor, and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Lett.* **245B** (1990) 409; H. P. Nilles and M. Olechowski, *Phys. Lett.* **248B** (1990) 268; P. Binetruy and M. K. Gaillard, *Phys. Lett.* **253B** (1991) 119.
20. M. Cvetič, A. Font, L. E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst, and F. Quevedo, *Nucl. Phys.* **B361** (1991) 194.
21. S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst, and F. Zwirner, “Duality-Invariant Partition Functions and Automorphic Superpotentials for (2,2) String Compactifications,” preprint CERN-TH.6090/91; D. Lüst, “Duality Invariant Effective String Actions and Automorphic Functions for (2,2) String Compactifications,” preprint CERN-TH.6143/91.
22. S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D14** (1976) 2460.
23. S. Coleman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B307** (1988) 867; S.B. Giddings and A. Strominger, *Nucl. Phys.* **B307** (1988) 854.
24. S. Coleman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B310** (1988) 643; B. Grinstein and M. Wise, *Phys. Lett.* **212B** (1988) 407; J. Preskill, *Nucl. Phys.* **B323** (1989) 141; S. W. Hawking, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335** (1990) 155.
25. S. W. Hawking, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199; *Phys. Rev.* **13** (1976) 191.
26. W. H. Zurek and K. S. Thorne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 2171; K. S. Thorne, R. H. Price, and D. A. Macdonald, *Black Holes: The Membrane Paradigm* (Yale University Press, 1986).
27. G. ‘t Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335** (1990) 138; “The Black Hole Horizon as a Quantum Surface,” *Nobel Symposium 79*, June 1990, and references therein.
28. M. J. Bowick, S. B. Giddings, J. A. Harvey, G. T. Horowitz, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988) 2823.
29. J. Preskill and L. M. Krauss, *Nucl. Phys.* **B341** (1990) 50; J. Preskill, “Quantum Hair,” Caltech preprint CALT-68-1671, *Nobel Symposium 79*, June 1990; S. Coleman, J. Preskill, and F. Wilczek, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A6** (1991) 1631.
30. S. Kalara and D. V. Nanopoulos, “String Duality and Black Holes,” preprint CTP-TAMU-14/91, March 1991.
31. J. H. Schwarz, “Can String Theory Overcome Deep Problems in Quantum Gravity?” preprint CALT-68-1728, May 1991.
32. T. J. Allen, M. J. Bowick, and A. Lahiri, *Phys. Lett.* **237B** (1990) 47.

33. R. Rohm and E. Witten, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **170** (1986) 454. C. Teitelboim, *Phys. Lett.* **167B** (1986) 69.
34. M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett.* **149B** (1984) 117.
35. D. Garfinkle, G. T. Horowitz, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev.* **D43** (1991) 3140; see also G. Gibbons, *Nucl. Phys.* **B207** (1982) 337 and G. Gibbons and A. Maeda, *Nucl. Phys.* **B298** (1988) 741.
36. J. Preskill, P. Schwarz, A. Shapere, S. Trivedi, and F. Wilczek, “Limitation on the Statistical Description of Black Holes,” preprint IASSNS-HEP-91-34.
37. J. Ellis, S. Kelley, and D. V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett.* **249B** (1990) 441 and **260B** (1991) 131; U. Amaldi, W. de Boer, and H. Fürstenau, *Phys. Lett.* **260B** (1991) 447; P. Langacker and M.-X. Luo, preprint UPR-0466T (1991).